

The Examiner has also indicated that this response should include a listing of all claims readable on this embodiment. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-3, 5, 13-14, and 16-17 are apparatus claims that are readable on the embodiment shown in FIG. 2. Further, claims 24 and 26-27 are method claims that could be implemented using the embodiment of the apparatus shown in FIG. 2.

Applicants would also like to point out that independent claims 1 and 13 would also be readable on the embodiments shown in FIGS. 3-7 and 9 and that independent claim 24 is a method claim that could be implemented using the embodiments of the apparatuses shown in FIGS. 3-7 and 9. Some of the claims dependent on claims 1, 13, and 24 are directed to the specific embodiments shown in FIGS. 3-7 and 9.

None of the limitations specified in claims 1, 13, and 24 are mutually exclusive of any of the elected or non-elected species. As noted in M.P.E.P. Section 806.04(f), "claims to be restricted to different species must recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species." (Emphasis added.) Since the limitations presented in claims 1, 13, and 24 are not mutually exclusive of either the elected or non-elected species, prosecution of these claims in the present application is proper and is respectfully requested.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 50-2115 for any additional fees which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Karen Dana Oster  
Reg. No. 37,621  
Of Attorneys of Record  
Tel: (503) 810-2560